UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/721,063	11/24/2003	Srinivasan N. Rao	14846-32	3266
7590 02/06/2008 GEORGE MORGAN LOWENSTEIN SANDLER, PC 65 LIVINGSTON AVENUE			EXAMINER	
			BROWN, CHRISTOPHER J	
ROSELAND, 1			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2134	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
•			02/06/2008	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

		· / ////				
t	Application No.	Applicant(s)				
	10/721,063	RAO ET AL.				
Office Action Summary	Examiner ,	Art Unit				
	Christopher J. Brown	2134				
The MAILING DATE of this communication Period for Reply	appears on the cover sheet with	h the correspondence address				
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR RE WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILINC Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFI after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory pe Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by st Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mearned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	G DATE OF THIS COMMUNIC R 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a report of the community of	ATION. bly be timely filed HS from the mailing date of this communication. INDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).				
Status						
1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 1	<u> 9 November 2007</u> .					
2a)⊠ This action is FINAL . 2b)☐ This action is non-final.						
· ·	3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is					
closed in accordance with the practice und	er <i>Ex parte Quayle</i> , 1935 C.D.	11, 453 O.G. 213.				
Disposition of Claims						
4) ⊠ Claim(s) 1-15 is/are pending in the applicate 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are with 5) □ Claim(s) is/are allowed. 6) ⊠ Claim(s) 1-15 is/are rejected. 7) □ Claim(s) is/are objected to. 8) □ Claim(s) are subject to restriction are	drawn from consideration.					
Application Papers						
9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Exam	niner.					
10) The drawing(s) filed onis/are: a)	accepted or b)□ objected to b	y the Examiner.				
Applicant may not request that any objection to	the drawing(s) be held in abeyand	ce. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).				
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the control of the control		•				
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119						
12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for fore a) All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority document	nents have been received. nents have been received in Appriority documents have been reau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).	oplication No received in this National Stage				
Attachment(s)	· 	,				
1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)		ımmary (PTO-413) /Mail Date				
2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date	·	formal Patent Application				

Art Unit: 2134

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Amendment

The declaration filed on 11/19/07 under 37 CFR 1.131 has been considered but is ineffective to overcome the Saare US 2005/0015490 reference.

The evidence submitted is insufficient to establish diligence from a date prior to the date of reduction to practice of the Saare reference to either a constructive reduction to practice or an actual reduction to practice. The Examiner invites the applicant to show diligence between 2/2003 and 7/2003. There appears to be a 5 month gap where no diligence is shown.

Response to Arguments

The applicant has not argued against the Examiners rejection apart from the 1.31 declaration, thus the rejection has been repeated below in its entirety for convenience.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1, 2, 4-9, and 11-15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Saare US 2005/0015490 in view of Yabe US 2006/0015559

As per claim 1, 8, and 15, Saare teaches a single sign-on authentication system, comprising: an authentication component that determines whether a user is authenticated, (single sign on adapter implementing authentication mechanisms) [0014], [0016] Saare teaches if it is determined that the user is authenticated, the authentication component generates a connection request (user can request a resource after initial sign on) [0033] [0034]. Saare teaches an interface component that receives the connection request from the authentication component, the connection request including an identifier (sign on mechanism for resource servers receive identifiers and or passwords from portal server) [0035]. Saare teaches the interface component compares the received identifier with an expected identifier and, if they match, allowing access (signing on using an ID and password) [0041].

Saare does not teach including entitlement information with identification information.

Saare does not teach making the entitlement information available to a server associated with the interface component.

Yabe teaches including entitlement information in the request to the server (Mail ID) [0093], Fig 13.

10/721,063

Art Unit: 2134

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to use the entitlement information of Yabe in the request of Saare so that the server could retrieve desired user information.

As per claims 2, and 9 Saare teaches information used to authenticate a user (user identifier and password) [0017]. Saare does not teach entitlement information.

Yabe teaches entitlement information is an different from information used to authenticate the user (Mail ID).

As per claims 4 and 11 Saare teaches the single sign-on authentication system of claim 2, wherein the authentication component determines the entitlement information based on the information used to authenticate the user.

As per claims 5, and 12 Saare teaches the information used to authenticate the user includes one or more of a user identifier and a password [0017].

As per claims 6 and 13, Yabe teaches the entitlement information is contained in a header portion of a data packet (the Mail ID in the HTTP header) [0094] Fig 13.

As per claims 7 and 14, Yabe teaches the connection request is sent as an HTTP request (HTTP GET request) [0094] Fig 13.

Art Unit: 2134

Claims 3, and 10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Saare US 2005/0015490 in view of Yabe US 2006/0015559 in view of Song US 2005/0066037.

As per claims 3, and 10 the previous Saare-Yabe combination does not teach that the identifier is an IP address.

Song teaches that an identifier may be an IP address, [0061].

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to use the identifier IP address of Song with the single sign on system of Saare-Yabe because the IP address allows the authenticator to perform additional authentication algorithms, thus making the system more secure.

Conclusion

THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event,

Application/Control Number:

10/721,063

Art Unit: 2134

Page 6

however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Christopher J. Brown whose telephone number is (571)272-3833. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:30-6:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Kambiz Zand can be reached on (571)272-3811. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Christopher J. Brown

Christophen & Bou

1/31/08

KAMBIZ ZAND OUDERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER